DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 720 TM 007 355

AUTHOR	Goldberg, Melvin
TITLE	New York City Program Administrators Perceptions of the Helpfulness of Outside Mandated Evaluations on Administrative Decision-Making in ESEA Programs.
INSTITUTION	Educational Improvement Center of Northwest New Jersey, Cedar Knolls.
PUB DATE	Mar 78
NOTE	23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Problems; *Administrator Attitudes; Compensatory Education Programs; *Decision Making; Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluators; Models; Problem Solving; *Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; Rating Scales; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Program administrators for 64 Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs in New York City were asked to respond to a questionnaire rating scale concerning the helpfulness and quantity of information that had been provided to them by the program evaluators. The rating scale categorized areas of administrative decision making in five categories: students, staff, curriculum, finance, and facilities; and in terms of three steps in the decision-making process: problem awareness, finding possible courses of action, and choosing among alternative courses of action. The responses of 40 of the 64 questionnaires were usable and were analyzed by analysis of variance. The information judged to be most helpful was in the areas of curriculum and staff and in the problem awareness stage of the decision process. The area judged to have provided the least information was finance. The author recommends that evaluators and program coordinators work cooperatively to achieve evaluations that will facilitate decision making. (CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156720

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT CENTER

OF NORTHWEST NEW JERSEY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Melvin Goldberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

TM007 355

NEW YORK CITY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS PERCEPTIONS OF THE HELPFULNESS OF OUTSIDE MANDATED EVALUATIONS ON ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION-MAKING IN ESEA PROGRAMS

by
Melvin Goldberg

March 1978

Paper Presented at the March, 1978
American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting in Toronto, Canada

(32.18) Administrative R&E Focus

Printed in U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Many critics of educational program evaluations required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, maintained that evaluators have failed to meet the needs of decision makers (program administrators) for process or on-going program information. One of these critics was Daniel L. Stufflebeam. Stufflebeam, and others, have developed an evaluation model whose major purpose was to demonstrate how evaluators could provide helpful information to decision makers during the life of an educational program.[1]

This study attempts to focus some light on the Stufflebeam Model by examining the helpfulness, for administrative decision-making, of evaluative information provided by "outside mandated evaluation."[2] This study examined the extent to which Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) program administrators, in New York City, perceived outside mandated evaluations as helpful in five key areas of administrative decision-making, namely: students, curriculum, staff, finance, and facilities (including physical plant, materials and equipment). For each area of administrative decision-making, the administrator was asked to rate the quantity of information and the helpfulness of the information provided by the evaluator in each of three selected steps in the decision-making process.

1. Daniel L. Stufflebeam et al., Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making, (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1971).

2. "Outside mandated evaluation" refers to evaluation work that is generally performed by individual consultants from outside the New York City school system. These individuals are hired to evaluate specific ESEA programs. Evaluations can also be performed by staff internal to the New York City Board of Education. This paper concerns itself only with work performed by individual consultants from outside the New York City school system, henceforth called evaluators.

More specifically, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What were the perceptions of the program administrators as to the helpfulness of the information provided for decision-making by the evaluator with respect to each of the following steps in the decision-making process?

   a. Problem awareness. This includes recognizing a problem and/or defining and limiting a problem.

   b. Finding possible courses of action for problem-solving. This includes problem analysis and/or establishing criteria for problem solutions.

   c. Choosing among alternative courses of action. This includes weighing the advantages of each course of action.

2. What were the perceptions of the program administrators as to the quantity of information provided for decision-making by the evaluator with respect to each of the above steps in the decision-making process?

3. What were the perceptions of the program administrators as to the helpfulness of the information provided for decision-making by the evaluator with respect to each area of administrative decision-making?

   a. students
   b. staff
   c. curriculum
   d. finance
   e. facilities, including materials and equipment.

4. What were the perceptions of the program administrators as to the quantity of information provided for decision-making by the evaluator with respect to each of the above areas of administrative decision-making?

5. What were the perceptions of the program administrators as to the helpfulness of the information provided by the evaluator with respect to each step in the decision-making process (sub-problem #1) in each of the areas of administrative decision-making (sub-problem #3)?

6. What were the perceptions of the program administrators as to the quantity of information provided by the evaluator with respect to each step in the decision-making process (sub-problem #2) in each of the areas of administrative decision-making (sub-problem #4)?

SUBJECTS, MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

Evaluation of ESEA programs is mandated by both federal and state law. The vast majority of the centralized New York City ESEA programs were evaluated by the Office of Educational Evaluation (OEE). The evaluation effort was split between outside per-diem consultants (called evaluators) and OEE staff members. Fifty-five ESEA programs were evaluated by outside evaluators, while seventeen programs were evaluated by OEE staff members.

Individuals, to qualify as outside evaluators, must have had an earned M.A. or Ph.D. and prior evaluation experience. These evaluators had the responsibility for evaluating the programs assigned to them while the OEE had the responsibility for supervising the evaluators. The OEE prepared an evaluation design, budget, and guidelines for the evaluator. The evaluator, however, conducted the evaluation; that is, made the site visits, analyzed the test and other data, and prepared the final reports.

The subjects included in this study (those receiving the rating scale) were all of the sixty-four program administrators of centralized New York City ESEA programs evaluated by the OEE. The ESEA program administrators were responsible for the operation of their programs. In most cases, the administrators were licensed assistant principals or teachers assigned as program coordinators.

Rating Scale

The rating scale measures the perceived helpfulness of evaluative information for decision-making. The ESEA program administrators rated the evaluators on a two-dimensional scale: the helpfulness of evaluative infor-

mation provided in selected areas of administrative decision-making, and the helpfulness of evaluative information provided in each of the three steps of decision-making. For each of the five areas of administrative decision-making, and for each of the three steps of the decision-making process, the program administrators made one of the following responses: very helpful information for decision-making was provided by the evaluator (4 points); somewhat helpful information for decision-making was provided by the evaluator (3 points); minimally helpful information for decision-making was provided by the evaluator (2 points); the information provided for decision-making by the evaluator was not helpful (1 point); or no information was provided by the evaluator (0 points).

For each of the fifteen categories of response (the five areas times the three steps) of decision-making, the higher the score, the more helpful was the information supplied by the evaluator for decision-making as perceived by the administrator. It is therefore possible to ascertain the degree of helpfulness of evaluative information for each area, step, and category of the decision-making process. In each category of analysis, a mean score close to 1.0 represents a situation where program administrators perceive that very little help was provided by the evaluator. Mean scores close to 4.0 represent a situation where program administrators perceive much helpful information for decision-making was provided by the evaluator.

Administrators rate the information provided by the evaluator for both its quantity and its helpfulness. There are, therefore, two constructs in the study:

1. The helpfulness of the information provided by the evaluator, for decision-making, in selected areas of program administration.
2. The quantity of information provided by the evaluator, for decision-making, in selected areas of program administration.

very helpful	somewhat helpful	minimally helpful	not helpful

(CONSTRUCT OF HELPFULNESS)

large quantity	limited quantity	no information

(CONSTRUCT OF QUANTITY)

Reliability

The test-retest method was used for this study. The results of the reliability study are as follows:

TABLE 1

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATIONS FOR TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY, HELPFULNESS AND INFORMATION CONSTRUCTS --- (N=12)

Areas and Steps of Decision-Making	Correlations for Quantity Construct	Correlations for Helpfulness Construct
Areas of Decision-Making		
(a) Students	.49	.81**
(B) Staff	.73**	.87**
(C) Curriculum	.72**	.83**
(D) Finance	.84**	.68*
(E) Facilities	.68*	.69*
Steps of Decision-Making		
(1) Problem awareness	.66*	.72**
(2) Finding possible courses of action	.71*	.78**
(3) Choosing among alternative courses of action	.68*	.50
Overall Scale Reliability	.69*	.88**

* Means that the correlation was significant at the .05 confidence level.
** Means that the correlation was significant at the .01 confidence level.

The results of the reliability study presented in Table 1 were significant for sixteen of the eighteen correlations. The overall scale reliability for the quantity construct was .69. The overall scale reliability for the helpfulness construct was .88. Both correlations were significant. It can be concluded from the reliability study that respondents demonstrated consistency when completing the rating scale.[1]

Treatment of the Data

The helpfulness and quantity constructs were analyzed separately. Two identical analysis of variance designs were used. A ramdomized block factorial (RBF-pq) analysis of variance design was used for this study. This model was used because each subject received all ab treatment combinations.[2]

1. Instrument validity was obtained through the use of a committee of experts who examined each scale item. The committee made some minor changes in the scale prior to the administration of the reliability study.

2. Roger E. Kirk, Experimental Design Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences, (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1968), pp.237-243.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

A total of sixty-four questionnaires were distributed. Forty questionnaires, or 62.5 percent were returned in usable condition. Two additional questionnaires were returned, but were not usable.

Analysis of the Helpfulness Construct

Table 2 presents the results of the ANOVA analysis. For the purposes of computation of the F value, a fixed effects model was used.

TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE OF THE HELPFULNESS OF EVALUATIVE INFORMATION

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F value
1. Blocks	514.62	39	13.19	19.11**
2. Treatments	52.19	14	-----	-----
3. A (Areas)	23.95	4	5.98	8.66**
4. B (Steps)	27.05	2	13.52	19.59**
5. AB	1.19	8	.14	.20
6. Residual	378.77	546	.69	-----
7. Total	945.58	599		

** Significant at the .01 level.

Significant F values (at the .01 level) were found for blocks, areas, and steps. That is, the variability between treatment levels was greater than the variability within treatment levels. Interaction was not significant. Therefore, it was concluded that further analysis was necessary. A posteriori comparisons of the helpfulness means were performed using the Neuman-Keuls method.

Table 3 presents the area and step means for the helpfulness construct. According to the program administrators, the least helpful information that was provided concerned school facilities. The information provided concerning students and finance received equal ratings in the middle of the range.

TABLE 3

AREA AND STEP MEANS FOR THE HELPFULNESS AND QUANTITY OF EVALUATIVE INFORMATION PROVIDED

	Source	Mean Helpfulness Rating	Mean Quantity Percentile
	Areas		
A1	Students	2.42	.54
A2	Staff	2.66	.66
A3	Curriculum	2.71	.67
A4	Finance	2.42	.49
A5	Facilities	2.15	.65
	Steps		
B1	Problem awareness	2.77	.64
B2	Finding possible courses of action	2.36	.60
B3	Choosing among alternative courses of action	2.29	.56
	Total	2.47	.60

The most helpful information provided by the evaluator was in the area of program staffing and program curriculum. In terms of the areas of administrative decision-making, the mean helpfulness ratings ranged from a low of 2.15 for facilities to a high of 2.71 for curriculum.

In terms of the steps of the decision-making process, the most helpful information was provided in helping administrators become aware of a problem. Finding possible courses of action and choosing among alternative courses of action received considerably lower mean helpfulness ratings than the problem awareness step in the decision-making process. The mean helpfulness ratings for the steps of the decision-making process ranged from a high of 2.77 for problem awareness to a low of 2.29 for choosing among alternative courses of action.

Table 4 presents the Neuman-Keuls analysis. In Neuman-Keuls, the means (separately for areas and steps) are arranged in ascending order and compared with each other. Looking first at the analysis for the areas of administrative decision-making, we see that eight of the ten possible comparisons among means were significant at the .05 level or better. The only non-significant comparisons were between students and finance and between staff and curriculum. In summary, the information provided by the evaluators concerning program curriculum and program staff was significantly more helpful to administrators than the information provided concerning students and finance. Concurrently, the information provided by the evaluators concerning program students and program finance was significantly more helpful to administrators than the information provided concerning facilities.

TABLE 4

A POSTERIORI COMPARISONS OF HELPFULNESS MEANS: NEUMAN-KEULS ANALYSIS

Areas		A_5	A_1	A_4	A_2	A_3
A_5	(2.15)	--	.27**	.27**	.51**	.56**
A_1	(2.42)		---	.00	.24*	.29**
A_4	(2.42)			---	.24*	.29**
A_2	(2.66)				---	.05
A_3	(2.71)					---

Steps		B_3	B_2	B_1
B_3	(2.29)	--	.07	.48**
B_2	(2.36)		---	.41**
B_1	(2.77)			---

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level
A_5 = Facilities
A_1 = Students
A_4 = Finance
A_2 = Staff
A_3 = Curriculum
B_3 = Choosing among alternative courses of action
B_2 = Finding possible courses of action
B_1 = Problem awareness

Looking at the Neuman-Keuls analysis for the steps of the decision-making process, we see that two of the three possible comparisons among means were significant at the .01 level. The non-significant comparison was between choosing among alternative courses of action and finding possible courses of action. In summary, the information provided by the evaluators concerning problem awareness was significantly more helpful to administrators than the information provided concerning the second and third steps in the decision-making process.

Analysis of the Quantity Construct

Table 5 presents the results of the ANOVA analysis. As before, a fixed effects model was used for the purpose of computation of the F value.

Significant F values (at the .01 level) were found for blocks, areas, and steps. Interaction was not significant. Therefore, it was concluded that further analysis was necessary. A posteriori comparisons of the helpfulness means was performed using the Neuman-Keuls method.

Table 3 presents the area and step means for the quantity construct. According to the program administrators, the lowest percentage of information provided by the evaluator concerned program finance. The quantity of information provided by the evaluators concerning program students was also low. The largest percentage of information was provided in the areas of program staff, curriculum, and facilities. In terms of the areas of administrative decision-making, the mean quantity percentile ratings ranged from a low of .49 for finance to a high of .67 for curriculum. The mean quantity percentile ratings were approximately the same for staff (.66), curriculum (.67), and facilities (.65).

In terms of the steps of the decision-making process, the largest percentage of information was provided by the evaluator in the decision-making step of problem awareness. When administrators were already aware of a problem, they tended to find lower quantities of information provided by evaluators in finding possible courses of action and choosing among courses of action. Administrators were least likely to receive evaluative information in the final step of the decision-making process. The mean quantity percentiles ranged from a high of .64 for problem awareness, to

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE OF THE QUANTITY OF EVALUATIVE INFORMATION

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F value
1. Blocks	46.10	39	1.18	19.67**
2. Treatments	3.98	14	----	-----
3. A (Areas)	3.28	4	.82	13.67**
4. B (Steps)	.59	2	.30	5.00**
5. AB	.11	8	.01	.17
6. Residual	30.05	546	.06	-----
7. Total	80.13	599		

** Significant at the .01 level.

.60 for finding possible courses of action, to a low of .56 for choosing among alternative courses of action. As one advanced through the steps of decision-making, the quantity of information provided by the evaluator declined.

Table 6 presents the Neuman-Keuls analysis. Looking first at the analysis for the areas of administrative decision-making, we see that six of the ten possible comparisons among means were significant at the .01 level. The non-significant comparisons were between the two groupings of means, $A_4 - A_1$, and $A_5 - A_2 - A_3$. All the comparisons between the two groups were significant. For example, the comparison between A_4 and A_5 was significant, as were all the other comparisons between finance or students, and the other three areas of administrative decision-making. In summary, the quantity of information provided by the evaluators concerning program finance and program students was significantly less than the quantity of information provided by the evaluators concerning staff, curriculum, and facilities.

Looking at the Neuman-Keuls analysis for the steps of the decision-making process, we see that one of the three possible comparisons among means was significant at the .01 level. The only significant comparison was between problem awareness and choosing among alternative courses of action. But more interesting than the significant comparison between the means, was the trend of downward mean quantity percentile ratings from .64 to .56.

TABLE 6

A POSTERIORI COMPARISONS OF QUANTITY MEANS: NEUMAN-KEULS ANALYSIS

Areas	A_4	A_1	A_5	A_2	A_3
A_4 (.49)	---	.05	.16**	.17**	.18**
A_1 (.54)		---	.11**	.12**	.13**
A_5 (.65)			---	.01	.02
A_2 (.66)				---	.01
A_3 (.67)					---

Steps	B_3	B_2	B_1
B_3 (.56)	---	.04	.08*
B_2 (.60)		---	.04
B_1 (.64)			---

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level
A_4 = Finance
A_1 = Students
A_5 = Facilities
A_2 = Staff
A_3 = Curriculum

B_3 = Choosing among alternative courses of action
B_2 = Finding possible courses of action
B_1 = Problem awareness

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A large quantity of information concerning ESEA program functioning was perceived to have been provided by the outside mandated evaluators. In 60 percent of the possible categories for which information could have been provided, program administrators perceived that information was provided. The overall helpfulness of the information provided by each evaluator was judged to be between minimally and somewhat helpful. However, when one examined the five selected areas of administrative decision-making and the three steps of the decision-making process, one noted an extremely wide range of mean ratings -- from somewhat helpful for decision-making to not at all helpful. The study's results and its implications are as follows:

1. In terms of the areas of administrative decision-making, large quantities of helpful information were perceived to have been provided by the evaluators concerning program staff and program curriculum. Considerably less information helpful to program administrators, was provided in the areas of program students, program finance, and program facilities. The information that was provided concerning program staff and program curriculum was perceived to be helpful for on-going program improvement. The specific kinds of helpful information provided by the evaluators in the areas of program staff and program curriculum were:

a. The degree to which actual classroom activities conformed with activities delineated in the program proposal.

b. The evaluator's perceptions of instructional and/or administrative staff morale.

c. The familiarity of staff with program objectives.

d. Inservice staff training for professional and/or paraprofessional staff.

e. The quantity of professional and paraprofessional training.

f. The classroom performance of each staff member visited.

The relatively low ratings achieved for information concerning program finance is judged to be a serious problem. The importance of providing cost effective analysis information cannot be over emphasized. Many issues in resource allocation, especially in economically difficult times, revolve around the issue of the relative cost of alternative programs, practices, methods, or materials. By providing little helpful information in the area of finance, outside mandated evaluators, in New York City, were generally unable to provide for a major program need. On the other hand, a limitation of this study was that evaluators were not specially trained in cost analysis methods. Without any special training, the evaluators proved unable to provide useful information in this area.

2. In terms of the steps of the decision-making process, large quantities of helpful information were perceived to have been provided by the evaluators concerning the problem awareness step. Considerably less helpful information was provided concerning the second and third steps of the decision-making process -- finding possible courses of action and choosing among alternative courses of action. The differences were most striking when examining the mean helpfulness ratings for the steps of the decision-making process. Problem awareness received a rating of 2.77 (in the somewhat helpful range), while finding possible courses of action and choosing among alternative courses of action received ratings of 2.36 and 2.29 respectively (in the minimally helpful range).

This discrepancy points up another serious problem. Program administrators perceived that evaluative information provided them with an additional contact with the field, and that from this added contact new problems were exposed. On the other hand, when problems were already

known and appreciated by program staff, generally prior to the hiring of the evaluator, the evaluator was perceived as being less helpful in offering alternatives or problem solutions. It is, of course, easier to discern one has a problem than to find solutions to a problem once it has been identified. All of the above factors helped to reduce the ability of administrators to make use of evaluation information at the higher steps of the decision-making process.

3. According to Stufflebeam, the function of the evaluator in relation to program decision makers is to aid the decision maker in negotiating each step of the decision process by working to delineate the information which is needed, by obtaining this information, and by helping the decision maker to use the information. The results of this study, pertaining to the steps of the decision-making process, suggest that the relationship between the outside mandated evaluators and the program administrators was most effective in terms of delineating the information needed, and least effective in helping the decision maker to use the information.

Since the most efficacious use of the Stufflebeam Model should result in evaluators supplying the most helpful information in the final step of the decision-making process, the most efficacious use of the Stufflebeam Model was not achieved. To this researcher, one of the major impediments to a proficient and efficacious use of the Stufflebeam Model is that evaluators often are perceived, by program administrators, as being judges. When this occurs the full impact of the Stufflebeam Model cannot be achieved. Without mutual agreement between the parties (program administrators, upper level administrators, and evaluators) as to the exact role of the evaluation, the likelihood of obtaining helpful information from evaluators will tend to be limited to the first and second decision-

making steps. The mutual agreement, drawn up in advance of the evaluation effort, should very carefully spell out the possible decision alternatives to be examined, the information that needs to be gathered, the records the evaluator will examine, and the method and timing of the data presentation. When all parties to an evaluation jointly define and limit the expected results of an evaluation, then the full potential of the Stufflebeam Model can be achieved.

The results of this study do not represent a criticism of the Stufflebeam Model of evaluation, but a condition under which the Model should be used. The Model should be considerably more effective when the conditions of prior mutual agreement are met than when the conditions are ignored.

Recommendations

The first study recommendation relates to the finding that program administrators tend to find evaluative information which makes them aware of a problem more helpful than evaluative information concerning the examination or the solution to a problem. Based on this finding, it is recommended that collaboration between evaluator and program administrator must be built up through negotiation and through interaction. Preferably, this collaboration should begin at the planning stage prior to the implementation of a program, or early in program life. Glennan suggests that program administrators and evaluators conduct a "contingency analysis" before the evaluation is started. Such an analysis would pose questions about decisions to be made if one or another result is obtained. If an

evaluator could propose a set of alternatives that have implications for future planning, evaluation would have a direct link with decision-making.[1]

Therefore, if a "Stufflebeam type" of evaluation is deemed important, then it is recommended that:

a. A contingency analysis be made part of the requirements of evaluation.

b. The specific functions of the contingency analysis should be spelled out to both the evaluators and the program administrators.

c. Both the evaluators and the program administrators should be trained in the purposes and practices (procedures) of a contingency analysis.

d. The results obtained from a contingency analysis should be reviewed by all parties concerned to determine if the decision makers have made further use of evaluative information. This step, of course, would lead to a replication of this study.

A second study recommendation relates to the finding that evaluators supplied considerably less helpful information in the area of program finance than in three of the other areas of administrative decision-making. Based on this finding, it is recommended that the Office of Educational Evaluation (the agency hiring the evaluators) should determine the extent to which program administrators and other decision makers perceive a need for program finance information. If it is determined that program finance information is deemed important, then it is recommended that:

---

[1]Thomas K. Glennan, Jr., "Evaluating Federal Manpower Programs," Notes and Observations in Evaluating Social Programs, Theory, Practice, and Politics, Edited by Peter H. Rossi and Walter Williams, New York: Seminar Press, 1972, p 214.

a. A training program for the evaluators on the methodology and procedures of cost-effectiveness analysis be established.

b. The results obtained from a cost-effectiveness analysis should be reviewed by all parties concerned to determine if the decision makers have made use of evaluative information. This step would lead to a replication of this study, but with emphasis on cost-effectiveness information.

The most important study recommendation relates to the limitation this researcher believes is inherent in the Stufflebeam Model. To be effective, the Stufflebeam Model requires a considerable degree of cooperation between the evaluator and the program administrator. When evaluators are perceived as judges, there is less likelihood that the kinds of cooperation called for in the first study recommendation will occur. It is recommended that evaluators and program coordinators work cooperatively toward achieving the kind of cooperation needed to facilitate the use of the Stufflebeam Model. If the effort is not made, some other less demanding evaluation model is recommended.